

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-4 remain pending. Claims 1 and 4 are currently amended. No claims are added or canceled.

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

To justify the rejection, the Office Action merely provides form paragraph 7.34.07, which states that the claims are “generally narrative” and “replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.” However, the Office Action provides no indication of any claim recitation that supposedly errs in grammar, *etc.*, so much to be so unclear that a person skilled in the processor technology would not understand the claims.

That is, the Office Action does not provide an adequate justification of the rejection. Applicant respectfully asserts that, unless further explanation is provided, the indefiniteness rejection should be withdrawn. Adequate justification would include quotes of the supposedly indefinite recitations and corresponding explanation of why a person skilled in the processor technology would not understand these recitations.

Independent of the indefiniteness rejection, applicant amends the claims as shown above, due to the presence of informalities.

Claims 1-4 stand rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over *Siow et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,301,590) in view of *Hill et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,023,714). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The initial burden is on the PTO to establish a *Prima Facie* case of obviousness. See, for example, MPEP § 2142 (The initial burden is on the examiner to provide some suggestion of the desirability of doing what the inventor has done.).

However, regarding base claim 1, the Office Action only quotes blocks of text from the prior art (*Siow et al.*, from column 1, line 61, through column 2, line ~10, and *Hill et al.*, from column 2, lines 24-38) and portions of the claim (the preamble for comparison to *Siow et al.* and the body for comparison to *Hill et al.*) and then says it would have been obvious to combine the quoted prior art teachings to supposedly achieve the “benefit of having customized the layout of a web document having depended on the display device of the client.” However, the Office Action does not indicate which teachings of the cited prior art supposedly correspond to particularly-recited claim elements. Without such indication, it cannot be apparent how the secondary reference supposedly suggests modifying the processor of the primary reference to have a customized layout of a web document having depended on the display device of the client.

As a specific example, note that base claim 1 specifies that the “display control file” of the inventive processor describes display control information for a Web page displayed on an external operation terminal unit. The Office Action indicates that *Siow et al.* does not specifically teach this feature. Instead, the rejection relies on *Hill et al.* to suggest modifying the *Siow et al.* Web architecture to have this feature. However, the Office Action does not indicate which part of the *Hill et al.* disclosure supposedly teaches or suggests this element. Without such indication of how the applied prior art supposedly teaches or suggests the recited claim element, the obviousness rejection cannot be justified.

Additionally, base claim 1 also specifies that the CGI script division of the inventive processor: (1) analyzes the description of the display control file that the Web browser designates; (2) executes a processing program of the processor’s processing program division; and (3) outputs display control information in the display control file to the Web browser based on the result of the processing. However, the Office Action does not indicate which parts of the

*Hill et al.* disclosure supposedly teach or suggest a CGI script division that performs each of these claimed actions. Without such indication of how the applied prior art supposedly teaches or suggests these actions, the obviousness rejection is not justified for this additional reason.

Applicant respectfully asserts that, unless the appropriate explanation is provided, the obviousness rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn. Because claims 2-4 depend from claim 1, the obviousness rejection of those claims also should be withdrawn for at least the reason of their dependency.

In view of the remarks above, applicant now submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowability is hereby requested. If for any reason it is believed that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, applicant petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension, or any other fees which may be due, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Joseph L. Felber  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 48,109

1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
Tel: (202) 822-1100  
Fax: (202) 822-1111

Atty. Docket No. **001475**

JLF/asc

Q:\2000\001475\001475 response to 2-24-04 action.doc

Enclosure: Petition for Extension of Time